



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/611,296	07/01/2003	Sarah Rose Hertel	125736	5583
7590 01/18/2007				
Dean D. Small		EXAMINER		
Armstrong Teasdale LLP		KISH, JAMES M		
Suite 2600				
One Metropolitan Square		ART UNIT		
St. Louis, MO 63102		PAPER NUMBER		
		3737		
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MONTHS	01/18/2007	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/611,296'

Applicant(s)

HERTEL ET AL.

Examiner

James Kish

Art Unit

3737

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 November 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-25 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3, 5-6, 8, 10, 12, 14-15, 17, 19-20, 23 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gagnon et al.'777 (US Patent No. 6,787,777) in view of Shao et al.'142 (US Patent No. 6,928,142), further in view of Suddarth et al. (US Patent No. 7,011,814). Gagnon et al.'777 discloses the use of positron emission tomography (PET) and single photon emission computed tomography (SPECT) (column 1, lines 10-15). Also disclosed is the knowledge that while SPECT provides structural data, which would be beneficial to use to localize a region of interest (ROI) for purposes of image registration with a PET, or function, image. It is stated as an example that in oncology, this could be used to assess lesion progression and treatment effectiveness (column 2, lines 33-49). However, Gagnon et al.'777 does not discuss how the selection process is performed. Shao et al.'142 teaches a computer workstation for controlling the imaging system (see Abstract). Via this computer, the operator manually

Art Unit: 3737

selects a ROI of the subject on an X-ray image (column 7, lines 41-44). By manually selecting the ROI, this region is defined by having a particular area or volume. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the selection process taught by Shao et al.'142 in the registration discussed by Gagnon et al.'777 to provide an easy system with which the operator can select a ROI.

While Gagnon discusses the use of PET imaging to acquire metabolic information, there is no explicit discussion of correlation of relative metabolic activity with an abnormality based on a threshold value within the PET image. However, Suddarth teaches analyzing metabolized glucose data by comparing the data to absolute threshold data established from population norms or to relative data either normal or tumor data taken on the subject previously. The data can be used in a quantitative manner to establish concentration, quantity, rates, speed of the biochemical cycle, and the like. See column 19, lines 34-42; column 20, lines 20-43; and column 24, line 61 through column 25, line 18. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the analyzing steps proposed by Suddarth in the system of Gagnon in order to determine whether tissue is malignant column 7, lines 1-6).

Claims 2, 4, 7, 11, 13, 16, 21-22, 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gagnon et al.'777 in view of Shao et al.'142, further in view of Suddarth et al.'814 as stated in the rejection of claims 1, 3, 5-6, 8, 10, 12, 14-15, 17, 19-

Art Unit: 3737

20, 23 and 25 above, and further in view of Townsend et al.'476 (US Patent No. 6,490,476). Gagnon et al.'777 teaches registering PET images with SPECT images in order to determine metabolic activity of abnormalities, such as lesions. Shao et al.'142 teaches manual selection of a ROI via a computer workstation. However, neither Shao nor Gagnon discuss an order of retrieving images. Townsend et al.'476 teaches the CT scan as being acquired before the PET scan, following a 60 minute uptake period (column 13, lines 19-21). Townsend also teaches scaling of the PET pixel values to display them with the same pixel size as the CT images (column 14, lines 10-12). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use this order of operation as taught by Townsend in acquiring the images for the registration of Shao and Gagnon to allow the operator to select the ROI on the CT scan, or first image.

With regard to claim 7, Townsend et al.'476 discloses a method of discrimination between relevant and irrelevant metabolic activity by PET-CT registration (column 3, lines 30-40).

With regard to claim 13, Townsend et al.'476 discloses a method of interpolating the lower resolution PET image on to the higher resolution CT image for image fusion (column 14, lines 20-25).

With regard to claim 24, see figure 10A, which a CT image of primary lung cancer.

Art Unit: 3737

Claims 9 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gagnon et al.'777 in view of Shao et al.'142, further in view of Suddarth et al.'814 as stated in the rejection of claims 1, 3, 5-6, 8, 10, 12, 14-15, 17, 19-20, 23 and 25 above, and further in view of Ferrant et al.'762 (US Patent No. 6,597,762). Gagnon et al.'777 teaches registering PET images with SPECT images in order to determine metabolic activity of abnormalities, such as lesions. Shao et al.'142 teaches manual selection of a ROI via a computer workstation. However, neither Shao nor Gagnon discuss using a specific software tool, such as Advanced Lung Analysis, for determination purposes. Ferrant et al.'762 teaches the use of CT Advanced Lung Analysis for the automatic segmenting and sizing of lung lesions that have been identified by a radiologist (column 1, lines 12-18). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize software for automatic segmenting and sizing to provide tremendous capability for radiologists to identify lesions in two or three dimensional views (column 1, lines 32-34).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James Kish whose telephone number is 571-272-5554. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 - 5:00 ~ Mon. - Fri..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian Casler can be reached on 571-272-4956. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3737

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JMK


BRIAN L. CASLER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700